



**STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS  
FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARY REVIEW  
COMMITTEE  
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 381B  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012**

**Wednesday, July 13, 2011**

**2:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Pedersen, Vice Chair Holoman, Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Ollague, Commissioner Choi, Commissioner Escandon, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hollister, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Napolitano, Commissioner Hoffenblum, Commissioner Sun, Commissioner Mejia and Commissioner Tse

**Excused:** Commissioner Friedman, Commissioner Flores and Commissioner Hernandez

- 1. Call to Order and Introduction by Chair Pedersen. (11-3272)**

**The meeting was called to order by Chair Pedersen at 2:16 p.m.**

**He informed all in attendance that the Boundary Review Committee meeting will be streamed live and transcribed, same as for the July 11, 2011 meeting.**

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

- 2. Approval of Minutes of July 6, 2011. (11-3274)**

**The Minutes from the meeting of July 6, 2011 were not available. Therefore, as requested at the meeting of July 11, 2011, the Committee will be given the opportunity to review the minutes and any subsequent changes will be submitted to County Counsel for review and final approval by the Chair.**

**Attachments:** [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT](#)

**Public Comment**

3. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-3291)

**Members of the public were called up to address the Committee as follows:**

1. **John C Addleman, City Councilman of Rolling Hills Estates located in the Palos Verdes Peninsula – My Councilmembers and I do not want to be removed from the leadership of Supervisor Don Knabe and out of the 4th District. He knows the elected, the challenges and concerns of Rolling Hills Estates. There is a concern with the S1 Plan submitted. It shows the total population moved in excess of 3 million residents. If this plan is chosen, it can easily have an effect of disenfranchising residents. Even the most urgent efforts of new Supervisors and their staffs would be overwhelmed by new cities, new residents and new Councilmembers that do not know local issues and problems. The institutional memory of Supervisors cannot be overstated.**
2. **Brenda Jahn, President of the Whittier Republican Women – We agree with Councilman Addelman’s statement. We want to retain our boundaries. We would be willing to take in other cities, but want to stay in the 4th District. Supervisor Don Knabe has been an outstanding non-partisan leader who is very responsive to the needs of the nonprofits in the area. His contributions to the area have been outstanding and we don’t want to loose him or to have the 4th District disrupted in any way.**
3. **Jim Edwards, Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Cerritos – We would not like the boundaries of the 4th District changed. Don has done so much for our City. With our nonprofits, they are dependant on charities and receiving funds. Supervisor Knabe has been a real friend to so many of the nonprofits in our area such as Pathways, a community sponsored Hospice, and Community Family Guidance. We would hate to loose him and request that the Committee retain the boundaries as they are right now.**
4. **Lynne Ebenkamp, resident of Rowland Heights – The unincorporated areas like Rowland Heights would be at a real disadvantage if the continued representation from Supervisor Knabe was disrupted. We rely on consistent County Government to represent us. What we have now is working, so please do not try to fix it. We have worked years to build the rapport with our Supervisor and his staff. Any district change would set us back. She asked from members of the audience for a show of hands for support in keeping Rowland Heights as is.**

5. **Wahib Elannan, resident of Norwalk – Against any split of Norwalk.** He would like the boundaries to stay intact due to projects that are ongoing, and issues such as the environment and water resources.
6. **Gordon Stefenhagen, 30 year resident of Norwalk – After 18 years with the Norwalk City Council and 4 terms as Mayor, I have had an opportunity to work with Supervisor Knabe and saw what he has done for our City. He and his staff are outstanding and understand what Customer Service is about. Supervisor Knabe supported the entire library system, especially Norwalk Libraries. Supervisor Knabe was always available for the 27 cities that are within the Gateway Council of Governments when needed. We would like to see Supervisor Knabe and his District retained as is. He has been a true friend of the City.**
7. **Tom Long, Mayor of Rancho Palos Verdes – We would like to remain as part of the 4th Supervisory District because our Supervisor uniquely understands the particular needs of contract cities. Most of the contract cities are in the 4th Districts. If there is a new Supervisor for the contract cities, it would be a great burden to ask them to understand the unique needs of a contract city when they are already well understood by the existing representative.**
8. **Michelle Tse, on behalf of the City of Norwalk Mayor Mike Mendez, read from a letter submitted to the Boundary Review Committee members at the meeting. The letter requested the City of Norwalk remain within the 4th District. She added having the same supervisory representative would be extremely helpful in accomplishing the City's long term goals. The letter was signed by Mayor Michael Mendez, Vice Mayor Cheri Kelley, Councilmember Marcel Rodarte, Councilmember Leonard Shryock and Councilmember Luigi Vernola.**
9. **Steven Zuckerman, Mayor of Rolling Hills Estates – Echoed his colleague, Tom Long and Councilman Addelman's comments, noting the Council, unanimously requests that the City be left in District 4th with Supervisor Knabe. This will not only minimize aggregate population change, but also minimize cost. There are real economies of experience that are relied upon in dealing with Supervisor Knabe and his staff on a daily basis. This is not something that can be easily replicated if there is a change.**
10. **Diane J. Martinez, Councilmember of the City of Paramount – Shared the views of the Paramount City Council noting they were against any boundary changes in Los Angeles County. Paramount is interwoven with many of the neighboring cities within the 4th District. Relationships have been developed and trust has been built with officials in these cities. Breaking up any of these cities from the 4th District would fracture our community. Paramount is a contract city that has special**

concerns when it comes to law enforcement because it uses the services of the County Sheriff's Department. We believe that Paramount being in the 4th District is essential because Supervisor Knabe understands the issues that contract cities face. Please take into consideration, specifically that moving Paramount to another District would be unsettling and regrettable.

11. Sara Pol Lim, Executive Director of the United Cambodian Community in Long Beach – On behalf of the staff, volunteers, clients and community-based partners, we support the current 4th District boundary lines. To have a new District will affect the relationship and voice that the Cambodian Community has with the 4th District and Supervisor Knabe. We are here to support keeping the 4th District together so that we can continue to represent the community and to have a voice in the Asian Community at large.
12. Ted Ebenkamp, 1st Vice President of the Rowland Heights Community Council – Gave an example of why the current boundaries should remain. Pathfinder Road was resurfaced and when they restriped it, they made an error. The left hand turn lane was turned into a center median. I contacted Dick Simmons from Supervisor Knabe's office and he immediately responded to me sharing an email he had sent to the Department of Public Works advising them of the problem. The following day, there were workers on Pathfinder Road correcting the error. We have problems like that in our local communities. If we have to go through the County bureaucracy, it would have been longer. Here they did it in one day.
13. Sithary Ly, with Families of Good Health in Long Beach – I represent the Cambodian and Laos Community in Long Beach. We want District 4 to stay the same and we want the community to stay together. Splitting the 4th District would significantly lower the API (Asian, Pacific Islander) index and the API voice would not be heard. Keep the API together in the 4th District. This will help the Cambodian community, especially the minority communities strengthen their voice and projects would be successful.
14. Kimthai Kuoch, Executive Director of the Cambodian Association of America – Here as a concerned citizen and on behalf of my fellow Cambodians, came to appeal to the Boundary Review Committee to adopt a plan that will not divide Long Beach or Signal Hill in to two or more Los Angeles County Supervisorial Districts. If Long Beach and Signal Hill split, it will significantly affect our communities of interest because it could result in reduced service quality and timeliness from the County and diminish our voting strength. In Long Beach, the Cambodian Community has been split into three different Council

- Districts already. In the Asian Community, the Cambodian Community is a minority among the minority groups. To further split the Cambodian Community would diminish our voice to almost non-existent and this community will be unfairly underrepresented. Supervisor Don Knabe and his staff have been fair, supportive and responsive to the API issues. We do not want any interruption to this relationship during these difficult economic times. We would appeal the Committee adopt a redistricting plan that has Long Beach and Signal Hill in the 4th District.
15. Malou Mariano, a Pilipino American on the Board of Cambodia Town, Inc. - We strongly support keeping our community as part of the 4th supervisory District of Los Angeles County. Supervisor Knabe has built a sound relationship with the people because he is responsive and supportive of community-based programs. He cares about our quality of life in the future. Consider this input, as any redistricting change may have a significant impact on our lives.
16. Justine Calma, representing the Khmer Girls in Action (KGA) in Long Beach – We work with Cambodian youth to help them become leaders in their community. We have a good relationship with Supervisor Knabe because he is very supportive of young people. One way that he has helped was providing free bus rides to youth organizations. This may seem small, but to a small organization like KGA, it is very significant. The resources that he has given us have built our capacity to serve more youth. KGA recommends the revised Benchmark plan that keeps the current boundaries. It is in the best interests of the young people and families that we serve. We want to keep the members of Cambodian Town together and maintain the relationship with Supervisor Knabe.
17. Paisin Chanou, resident of Long Beach and Chairman of Cambodia Town Inc. – Our nonprofit organization is dedicated to help improve the social and economic well-being of residents in central Long Beach. I am here to oppose the redistricting plan that would split Long Beach from the 4th District. Cambodia Town shares a common interest and has worked closely with all the Asian Pacific Islander groups so we would lose an effective working relationship if Long Beach was split from the 4th District just when we started to improve our lives.
18. Rick Jennings, resident of Norwalk – Keep the boundaries the same.
19. Patrick Bouchard, Housing Director of the Whittier Area First Day Coalition (First Day) – We are a homeless shelter in Whittier with a 10-year relationship with District 4 and Supervisor Knabe. This has gained us a great potential in the continuation of service to the homeless population and also the at risk population. Don Knabe, through his leadership, guidance and being in tune with the needs of the community, has made us grow into what we are now. To change that would devastate everything that has been built.

20. Miriam Allen, resident and representative of First Day – Supervisor Knabe has been a strong supporter of First Day and me, he has helped with my education, my ability to be a property owner, and has helped with the transitional housing being supported by First Day. It would be a detriment to the entire 4th District to lose Supervisor Knabe as part of the 4th District.
21. Thomas Reed, resident at First Day – I met Supervisor Knabe doing volunteer work. He has done a lot for the homeless and elderly in the community; we would be lost without him.
22. Leslie L. Howard, 30-year resident of Whittier, a Professor at Whittier College and a participant on the Board of First Day – We are impressed in Whittier at how effectively Supervisor Knabe has worked with a broad range of community organizations. Even more important, he has nurtured collaborative relationships among those organizations. This is critical at a period of evaporating resources. It would be a problematic time to have these relationships disrupted by having them cut into new supervisory lines. As we think about our communities of interests, the network of relationships among NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) in the current District that includes Whittier, is one of the things that we think defines us as a community of interest among contiguous communities in which we are involved.
23. Mark Masaoka- conceded his time for Mariko Kahn as part of a joint presentation.
24. Mariko Kahn – resident of the 2nd District - Voiced her strong opposition to the LACBOS African American Plan S1. The current makeup of the current 4th District is a nice balance of all ethnic and socio-economic groups. The S1 Plan would radically change that. It turns the 4th District into a 52% Hispanic area and maintains the 1st District as Hispanic at 53%. But it does this by diluting the API numbers in the 4th District from the 17% in the Benchmark Plan to a mere 12%. The division of the City of Long Beach and its neighboring area is also very alarming. Some Commissioners expressed concern about the packing in the 1st District of Hispanics. Countywide, Hispanics comprise 43% of the voting age population. It was expressed that two Districts should be constructed to reflect that. I am not opposed to that, except that it comes at the expense of APIs. In the Benchmark Plan, the API percentage is more balanced among the 1st, 4th and 5th Districts, reflecting the higher concentrations of APIs in these Districts. Upon review of the data, I noted that all the plans, except the MALDEF ones,

protected the 2nd District for African Americans. The actual percentage of African Americans in the County is 8.7% and in the 2nd District, it is 25.1%. Yet, the 2nd District in nearly all the plans is packed at more than 31%. I am in favor of having a District with high numbers of African Americans as I believe they deserve representation. But there is something wrong here. When another ethnic group that is double in size, is not also afforded the same treatment. How is it that APIs, who comprise 15.5% of the County, do not have a District that is also packed in their favor? APIs have never had a Supervisor of their District. Why is that? And of the Plans, I am in favor of the Benchmark Plan because it at least tries to preserve the APIs communities of interest and causes the least disruption of County District boundaries.

25. Ted Knoll, a constituent of the 4th District and the Executive Director of the Whittier Area First Day Coalition (First Day) – This is a very fragile time for nonprofits. We have maintained a high degree of collaboration between the County, the City and the community itself. If Whittier is not kept in the 4th District, we will see a great dislocation.
26. Laura Stone, resident of Whittier since the late 1990s – I am disabled and am currently homeless. I voted for First Day. Changing location and direction is like starting all over. You really have your sense of direction.
27. Milton Trujillo - resident at First Day – Would like to thank Supervisor Knabe personally for his support of First Day and for giving me a second chance.
28. Gay Cormack, resident of Hacienda Heights and a member of the Whittier Republican Women Federated – We do not have a City Council but have a Supervisor that is very responsive to our concerns. I would like to retain the boundaries of the 4th District.
29. Mae Chu, a 12-year resident of Hacienda Heights, a Board member of the Hacienda Heights Improvement Association and a staff member of His Lai Temple – I am very pleased with the service provided by the County and under Supervisor Knabe. It is important because he understands the needs the residents of Hacienda Heights within the 4th District.
30. Vivian Hansen, Executive Director for the Norwalk Chamber of Commerce and School Board member of Paramount – I live and work in District 4 and I oppose the Plan to remove Norwalk and Paramount from District 4. Our cities share common regional issues that affect our business, our residents and our schools, such as transportation, education, water resources and infrastructure to name a few. Having one representative that understands and coordinates efforts to promote the business development is critically important. Splitting our

neighborhoods and cities would have a profound impact in our District. Starting over would not make sense and would impact the service quality and timelines we've come to expect. I urge the Committee to keep District 4 boundaries intact.

31. Caren Spilsbury, resident of Long Beach, raised in Lakewood and currently working for the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce – Having Supervisor Knabe representing all these areas is extremely important to me, as I am also involved in many volunteer organizations. Having the continuity and support of someone you have come to trust and to know, that someone is there consistently, is important to us. Economic considerations are also important as some of the plans being looked at could have a great economic impact on the County. We are all having economic difficulties and ask that the 4th District boundaries be maintained as they are with very little change and to keep Long Beach, Norwalk, Lakewood, Paramount, Downey and all the other communities in Supervisor Knabe's District.
32. Jeff Farber, Executive Director of Helpline Youth Counseling – Our offices are located in Norwalk and serve at risk youths and families throughout the 4th District including the cities of Norwalk, Whittier, Bellflower, Artesia, Downey, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, Paramount, Long Beach and unincorporated areas of Whittier. Supervisor Knabe and his staff have a keen awareness, understanding and commitment to residents of the 4th District. They are able to facilitate the process of bringing resources into the community, and they support efforts in the areas of economic development, juvenile delinquency prevention, child abuse prevention, partnerships and relationships. I urge you to maintain a whole 4th District and not separate communities.
33. Joseph Derthick, President of the Norwalk Chamber of Commerce and resident of the 4th District for 50 years – As a businessman, I see the synergy with all the communities that are currently located within the 4th District. Making a change for the sake of change would not be a good idea. Starting from square one is not a good idea for the business community. Don Knabe is a big supporter of nonprofits. Businesswise: Norwalk is the keystone city, where the rail hub, Long Beach and San Pedro are the port hubs and LAX is the international airport for the West Coast. It makes no sense to break up the District. Please keep it as it is.
34. Charles Frey, resident of Downey – Don Knabe has been very helpful to the City of Downey in the years I've lived in Downey. Not only did he support the City's efforts to acquire the Rockwell Boeing site and redevelopment, but he has also been instrumental in saving the Rancho Los Amigos National Rehabilitation Center. Had it not been for his efforts, it would have been closed several years ago. I personally believe that keeping the 4th District intact, the way it is, makes total sense.



35. Robert Thome, a disabled American and a patient at Rancho Los Amigos – Since 1969, the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors has been quick to try and close Rancho Los Amigos. Every decade we have had to voice our disappointments with those efforts. The only one that has consistently voted to keep Rancho open was Supervisor Knabe. In summary, Don Knabe has made the disabled community a part of the landscape of America. He is our hero. He is our voice. We urge you to keep Supervisor Knabe as our Supervisor in the 4th District.
36. Cassandra Tang, a patient at Rancho Los Amigos – Requests Supervisor Knabe be retained in the 4th District, as he has great knowledge about Rancho. He cares about our health and well-being. He has provided us with the tool, which is Rancho, so that we can strive to live a productive life. Supervisor Knabe has been our only supporter to keep Rancho open. I am concerned that under a different Supervisor, we will not get the support we need for Rancho and the quality of services would drop. This would be detrimental to the patients at Rancho. Please do not take us out of Supervisor Knabe's District.
37. William Lin, resident of Rowland Heights – Please keep Rowland Heights under one District – District 4.
38. Ana Maria Gutierrez, resident of South Whittier – It is very important for the community of South Whittier to have Spanish speaking representatives. In the past, when this community had a non-Spanish representative, the groups would never grow. Now that we have a Spanish speaking representative, the groups have grown quite a bit. She asked that her community be represented and continue to be represented in Spanish.
39. Teresa Corona, resident of South Whittier – Submitted letters from her community for the Boundary Review Committee. We need a Spanish speaking representative. Most of us are Hispanics and there is a language barrier. We would like a Supervisor to be appointed that speaks Spanish so that they can communicate with us.
40. John Mowet, over 40-year resident of Hacienda Heights – Don Knabe is head and shoulders over all who have preceded him and we need him. There are two Plans before the Committee today: S1 and A1. A1 keeps Hacienda Heights within the 4th District. Therefore I suggest the Committee choose the A1 Plan and keep Don Knabe as our Supervisor.
41. Jean Wall, member of the Whittier County Community Coordinating Council – We are more or less like the City Hall for the unincorporated area of Whittier. Without the supervision of Don Knabe, things would not be as great as they are right now. He has made a difference. Please keep Supervisor Knabe in the 4th District.

42. Charles Liu, 27-year resident of Rowland Heights and a member of the Rowland Senior Club. Rowland Heights is an unincorporated area. This Supervisor has had great power to affect the well-being of the community. It took us many years to develop an open, trusting and productive partnership between Rowland Heights and his District and Field Deputies. Rowland Heights is a growing community with a population of 60,000. Yet we do not have a Community Center for our residents, citizens and youths. With the help of Supervisor Knabe, there will soon be a Rowland Heights Community Center to serve all Rowland Heights residents in 2013. We do not want this project and others to be jeopardized due to redistricting. We urge the Committee to not take Rowland Heights from District 4.
43. James P. Tung, representing Ridgemoor Homeowners Association – Most of Rowland Heights is currently under District 4. There is a small portion that is represented by the 1st District. We ask that you include all of Rowland Heights within District 4.
44. Cassie Ritz, a lifetime resident of the 4th District and representing the Norwalk Senior Community – Don Knabe has been a tremendous help to everyone within the 4th District. He has always been there when we needed him. The 4th District is a geographically and racially diverse District of which Norwalk is the hub. The communities have been together for decades and share the same communities of interest. Splitting our neighborhoods would be like starting all over. Please keep the 4th District intact. She also submitted 68 letters from the Norwalk Senior Center.
45. Cary Chen, a 31-year resident of Rowland Heights and a Board member of the Rowland Heights School District – Rowland Heights has long been a part of the 4th District along with neighboring communities like Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar, Whittier and La Habra. We have been united in our common interests and goals as communities. We need to maintain cohesion among these communities in order to address our common challenges and continue in our similar development goals. Grouping Rowland Heights with the more urban communities in District 1 would fragment our communities and cause tension between different sets of priorities. Please keep Rowland Heights in District 4 and help us maintain our community's identity.
46. Rita Assoian, survivor as a result of Rancho Los Amigos under the leadership Supervisor Knabe – I am a direct result of the help given at Rancho Los Amigos. Supervisor Knabe is the only Supervisor that voted to keep Rancho open. Supervisor Knabe is a man that truly, loves, cares, and supports his community and fights for the patients at Rancho Los Amigos. We want to keep him as our Supervisor in the 4th District.

47. Angel J. Cabral, is a resident of the 1st District – Wants to keep the boundaries as they are.
48. Carol Gardner, a resident of Hacienda Heights for more than 20 years – Echoed support for retaining the 4th District boundaries as they are presently established. Supervisor Don Knabe happens to be a super Supervisor. That is why he is getting so much support.
49. Malin Olk, grew up in Cambodia Town and is a youth leader for the Khmar Girls in Action (KGA) – I and KGA want to remain in the 4th District as I want to have a voice. We do not want our community split apart. Youth interests are also the interests of our elders, and our voices are stronger together. Please keep our community within the 4th District.
50. Zinthia Alvarado, representing Rancho Los Amigos Pediatric Program – We don't want to lose Don Knabe for the 4th District. He has showed us he cares.
51. Denny Schneider, representing the Westchester area – We are the poster child for gerrymandering. We have two of everything, except a City Council member. It makes it very difficult to get anything done. What we ask of the Committee is to put the little area of Westchester from District 2 into District 4. We are a community of interest. This is the right thing to do to keep the communities together.
52. Carolyn Ann Reggio, Executive Director of Community Advocates for Peoples Choice (CAPC) – We assist in serving minority individuals with developmental disabilities to live and work on their own in the neighboring areas in the 4th District. It is because of Don Knabe's support and belief in the work that we do, individuals with disabilities are being moved out of segregated sites and into their home communities as productive members of society with their own places to live. Please allow us to continue to collaborate with the many nonprofits around, so that we can continue to do this. As a Past President of the Whittier Chamber of Commerce, we appreciate all the work that Don has done for both the City and County. On behalf of all the Past Presidents, Whittier, businesses and the community, I urge you to keep Whittier in the 4th District under Supervisor Knabe.
53. Lyn Carty, one of the Co-Executive Directors of the Whittier Chamber of Commerce – We represent 600 businesses in the greater Whittier area and the Whittier business community. Supervisor Knabe has been a wonderful advocate for businesses in Whittier and we do not want to lose him as our partner. Our location is very unique and often blurred, as Whittier "proper" is an island. It is very important that we get the opportunity to work hand-in-hand, so that anyone with a Whittier

address receives amazing services. This is exactly what happens with Supervisor Knabe. If Whittier is moved out of the 4th District, we worry about losing Don Knabe as our Supervisor and that would be a great loss. But we also worry that some forward movements and key initiatives within the City would be lost. We have worked for years with local, County, State and our own leaders within our community to secure the land that was formerly the Fred C. Nelles Youth Correctional Facility. Our residents are optimistic that changes are on the horizon and we are nervous that if we lose this partnership with Knabe, we will be set back. Whittier's relationship with Supervisor Knabe is the model of how government should work with constituents and local governments setting aside differences to work for the betterment of the greater population. We value having Don Knabe as our Supervisor and don't want to see things changed.

54. Eric Hernandez, a resident of La Mirada, a student at Whittier College working on a degree in Political Science, and a 10-year veteran of the Marine Corp – Supervisor Knabe has proved that he has a vested interest in our community as well as others in our District. It is undoubtedly in the best interest of La Mirada and Whittier to stay in Supervisor Knabe's 4th District.
55. Mary Lacey, a 50-year resident in the unincorporated area of Whittier and a retired school teacher in Whittier – I volunteer at the Whittier Substation for the Sheriff's Department and it is there where I had an opportunity to meet Don Knabe. My community has improved. There are plans for future improvements. And the support that he gives the Sheriff's Department is fantastic. I would hate to lose him. He is such a special person and supporter of our community.
56. Anita Rivera, a volunteer at the Whittier Substation for the Sheriff's Department – I have seen some of the things that he has done, the support that he has given and the admiration, faith and love that the people have for him. He is very supportive. We would miss him as Supervisor of the 4th District. Also, if possible, join South Whittier with the unincorporated area of Whittier.
57. Robert Wall, a resident of the unincorporated area of Whittier and a retired veteran - Don Knabe knows how to talk to people, take care of the people and run this huge District that he has. Don is a friend of the vet. He takes good care of the VA Hospital and goes out of his way to promote awareness of the contributions of the folks of District 4, while serving their country.
58. Kirk J. Real, a 66-year resident of Lakewood, a retired Bellflower School Administrator and serving on the Lakewood City Commission – I'm impressed with all the things that have been said about Supervisor

Knabe and his leadership. In quoting the slogan of the City of Lakewood, "Times Change, Values Don't," Mr. Knabe's values don't change. Mr. Knabe has retained the same values as when he was first appointed. Those values extend to his leadership style, into his warmth and empathy for the community. I am very supportive of retaining the existing boundaries.

59. Eddie Sierra, a past patient at Rancho Los Amigos, and working on his Masters in Physical Therapy – Personally thanks Don Knabe for all his work with Rancho Los Amigos. I want to keep Don Knabe as my Supervisor.
60. Bernie Obenberger, a volunteer at the Whittier Substation for the Sheriff's Department – I respect Don Knabe as he is so supportive. I hope we stay in the 4th District under Supervisor Knabe.
61. Grissel Chavez, a resident of Downey, and employed in the City of Norwalk – It is no secret that these communities share many regional issues. Having one Supervisor is critical in the many shared commonalities between them. Sharing one unified voice, results in truly effective government. Maintain Norwalk and Downey within the 4th Supervisorial District.
62. David Koo – a resident of Rowland Heights and representing the Rowland Heights Chinese Association – Supervisor Knabe has a unique understanding and supports the Asian community of Rowland Heights. All the Supervisors have done a tremendous job for the whole of Los Angeles County. We request to keep District 4 intact under Supervisor Knabe.
63. Fred Johnson, a survivor of a stroke – Supervisor Knabe is the only Supervisor that voted to keep Rancho Los Amigos open. If any of the other Supervisors were to take over Rancho Los Amigos, we would not be supported.
64. Greg Waskul, Executive Director of the Rancho Los Amigos Foundation – Supervisor Knabe and his staff have reached out across all socio and economic boundaries, helping give hope to our patients with catastrophic disabilities no matter what their age, gender, or ethnicity. He has helped Rancho start a lot of new programs. His understanding of Rancho's unique needs and his personal commitment has been major reasons why Rancho has been one of America's major hospitals for each of the last 22 years. Please keep us in the 4th District with our Supervisor that our patients know they can trust.
65. John Stinson, a resident of San Pedro and sitting on the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council, Angel's Gate Cultural Center, and San Pedro Art Association – Don and his staff do things right and have great relationships with the communities, the individuals and the groups

within the 4th District. We want to still be part of the 4th District because we would hate to lose that relationship, as you know you can call and they will respond.

66. Gilbert Salinas, a long-time resident of the 4th District and representing Rancho Los Amigos – I think we should all remain under the leadership of Don Knabe. He has been great to work with and has been very heroic in his support at Rancho. Without the visionary leadership of Jorge Orozco and Don Knabe, I don't know where I would be today. In collaboration, they have helped patients at Rancho become productive members of our society. Today I am asking you to keep us in the 4th District and continue the Rancho spirit and continue to support the patients at Rancho Los Amigos.
67. Haani Castillo, representing 12 members of the Patient Advisory Council at Rancho Los Amigos – I am here in support of Jorge Orozco and Don Knabe in the 4th District. As a past patient at Rancho, I would not be able to walk if it wasn't for their support.
68. Yolanda Guzman, a resident of South Whittier – I only speak Spanish, that's why I live where I live, because everyone speaks Spanish. On behalf of my town, we would all like to stay in one district.
69. Yolanda Guzman, a 40-year resident of South Whittier and part of the Neighborhood Watch – I am very pleased with the way Supervisor Gloria Molina has been representing us because we are a Hispanic community. We are very worried that we will not get representation for the Hispanic community. Most of our immigrants are coming from various other places. We would like to stay in the 1st District.
70. Judy Gordon, Director of Outreach and Volunteers at Rainbow Services - We are located in San Pedro and we serve domestic violence victims and their families. It is important to understand when change is needed and when it is not. I would like to urge this Committee, with the exception of uniting those few communities that have been split apart into different Districts, to maintain intact, the boundaries of District 4.
71. Ben Schirmer, Executive Director for Rainbow Services – We would urge this Committee, to maintain, the 4th District boundaries intact. Supervisor Knabe and his staff have done an amazing job of weaving the communities together.
72. Chris Sanchez, a 40-year resident of Hacienda Heights – I have worked closely with Supervisor Knabe and his office. He was present to lend his support in the closing the Puente Hills Landfill, the largest in the Country. Without the support of Supervisor Knabe, implementation would be in jeopardy. Supervisor Knabe is a visible force in bringing our community in to the 21st Century. I came on a bus from a senior center. They have asked me to mention that 32 seniors are here along with 63 letters of support were delivered in support of Supervisor Knabe.

The thought of losing Supervisor Knabe and his staff would be a physical blow. We think of him as a friend and family. We would hate to lose him as Supervisor in the 4th District.

73. Richard Herrera, resident of Whittier – I like the community of Whittier.

74. Victor Acevedo, President of the Mexican American Bar Association (MABA) – The Mexican American Bar Association (MABA) strongly supports a redistricting plan that contains two Latino majority Districts. This position is based on the recent release of Census Data, showing that Latinos represent 65% of the overall growth of the population on Los Angeles County. MABA represents the interests of more than 1,000 attorneys, judges and law students throughout the Los Angeles County and greater Southern California area. MABA has been a champion for Civil Rights and the empowerment of the Latino community. MABA opposes discrimination and seeks to ensure that Latinos have equal opportunities to lead and govern. As a result, MABA is particularly interested in ensuring that Latinos are able to fairly elect their representatives. In this regard, we believe that adopting a plan with two Latino Districts follows. It is necessary to avoid potentially violating Section 2 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Because of the growth of the Latino population, Los Angeles County must be vigilant in adopting a plan that avoids the wrongs of the not too distant past. The data before this Committee confirms that Latino population cores are being fragmented between supervisory Districts without justification. Therefore, to prevent further dilution for the growing number of Latinos, Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act requires that Los Angeles County adopt a plan that corrects, rather than continues, that historic fragmentation. Adopting such a plan is not only necessary, but is proper. The deliberate construction of minority-controlled voting Districts is exactly what the Voting Rights Act authorizes. Such districting, whether worked by a court or a political entity in the first instance, does not violate the Constitution. MABA strongly urges the Committee follow the law and adopt a redistricting plan that contains two Latino majority Districts.

75. Andrea Avila and Steve Meng submitted Public Speaker forms but did not speak.

## **II. REPORTS**

### **4. Report on redistricting website activity. (11-3279)**

**Susan Herman of the Chief Executive Office gave a verbal report of the redistricting website activities. She stated web-streaming activity on Monday, July 11, 2011 was the biggest surge on the County website. The increased activity occurred near the start of that meeting, with nearly 1,000 unique visitors to the Commission's webcast. As of today, the redistricting website has had over 30,414 unique visitors.**

**The most popular sections visited are as follows:**

- 1. Summary of Comments and Letters Received**
- 2. Meeting Schedule and Next Steps**
- 3. Submitted Plans**

**She noted that this kind of success shows that the Committee has engaged the public and constituents are expressing interest, carefully watching the proceedings in anticipation of the end result. Ms. Herman congratulated the Commission for making it an open process.**

**Martin Zimmerman of the Chief Executive Office, added that staff is posting correspondence as quickly as possible upon receipt (both emails and letters). We have received approximately 1,100-plus individual pieces of correspondence. Staff has the substantial task of organizing and categorizing all input. That information will be finished before it goes before the Board of Supervisors.**

**A broad outline of the correspondence received is as follows:**

- 1st District - Received correspondence seeking to unite South Whittier.**
- 2nd District - Received correspondence seeking to unite the unincorporated community of Florence/Firestone, currently divided between the 1st and 2nd Districts.**
- 3rd District - Received over 40 letters, the overwhelming majority of which support keeping the existing boundaries of the 3rd District. Many identified the Santa Monica Mountains as a community of interest that they want kept in one District.**



- **4th District - Received over 700 pieces of correspondence. The correspondence come from cities and constituents that overwhelmingly want to keep the boundaries of the 4th District intact.**
- **5th District - Received over 100 pieces of correspondence in virtually all in support of keeping the boundaries of the 5th District intact. Many relate to the unincorporated area of Altadena, urging that that this community remain in tact.**

**Commissioner Acebo asked where the testimony provided during the Community meetings is posted.**

**Mr. Zimmerman stated those summaries were depicted at the top of the web page of the Community meetings.**

**Commissioner Acebo asked if Mr. Zimmerman would be able to provide the Committee with a characterization of those comments similar to the written testimony?**

**Mr. Zimmerman did not have that information before him.**

- 5. Consideration of additional redistricting data. (11-3280)**

**There was no discussion or action taken.**

- 6. Presentation of summary of plans submitted by the public, review criteria, and discussion of approach for further review. (11-3286)**

**Mr. Zimmerman referred the Committee to the two documents within the supporting documents that were previously discussed during the last few meetings. The criteria show the amendments requested by the Committee, which is unchanged from the last meeting.**

**The summary of plans submitted (legal size document), were revised adding the two revisions discussed during the July 11, 2011 meeting. At the top of the page under the A1 Benchmark is the Proposed Amended A1. At the bottom is the Plan S1 and right below it is the Proposed Amended S1.**

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee regarding the testimony given during public comment. He stated, there were a variety of comments that sounded like they would lose Don Knabe, and that's not what it looks like in the Proposed Amended S1. Under the amended S1, many communities within the 4th District would be retained. Supervisor Knabe is a great Supervisor and does an excellent job for his constituents. However, this is not about whether or not a Supervisor is great. It is about not violating the Voting Rights Act by not packing a District which the A1 Proposed Amended continues to do with a 62% Latino CVAP (Citizen Voting Age Population) with minimal change.

Attachments:    [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Staff summary of plans submitted by](#)

7. Staff report on analysis of additional changes to plans as requested by Boundary Review Committee. (11-3287)

**Mr. Zimmerman gave an abbreviated submission of the plans.**

**Proposed Amended A1: reflects the changes discussed at the meeting of July 11, 2011:**

- Moving from the 5th to the 1st District: West Covina, with some specific RDUs in the Covina Islands area.
  - Moving from the 1st to the 4th District: Santa Fe Springs.
  - Moving from the 5th to the 3rd District: one RDU in the West Hills area of the San Fernando Valley
1. Total population deviation is 1.69%, where in the Benchmark it is 9.97%.
  2. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 150,121 where in the Benchmark there is no change.
  3. Deferred and Advanced Voting – Countywide, 1.5 % of the constituents of LA County will be affected in terms of their voting ability to be advanced or deferred.
  4. This plan does not displace any Supervisor from his or her District. It is contiguous and reasonably compact.
  5. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) – The percentages for CVAP versus the original A1 Benchmark is similar, most with less than a 1% differential. Two instances where the differential was slighter higher are:

	Benchmark A1	Revised A1
District 1 – Hispanic	63.3%	62.1%
District 5 – Hispanic	24.7%	23.5%

Otherwise the differences are very slight. While, the intent on Monday was to consolidate the unincorporated Rowland Heights into the 4th District; there are areas where that cannot be done because they are Islands within the 1st District. Therefore, they cannot be moved in to the 4th District. The two areas depicted on the map by Frank Cheng are unpopulated.

Commissioner Ollague asked the following questions:

1. Where on the map was the Covina Islands?
2. Was this an unincorporated area split?
3. Where is the unincorporated Covina?
4. Was Covina an Island or just an unincorporated Covina?
5. What is the population of the unincorporated Covina?

Mr. Cheng referenced the map depicted and responded to Commissioner Ollague's questions as follows:

1. Showed on the map where it was depicted
2. The unincorporated Covina Islands appear to be within the 1st District.
3. The unincorporated Covina is in the 5th District.
4. The portion of unincorporated Covina next to the Covina Islands was not an Island.
5. The portion of unincorporated Covina next to the Covina Islands has 2,952 plus 852, totaling 3,804 in population.

Proposed Amended S1: reflects the changes discussed at the meeting of July 11, 2011.

- Moving the remaining portion of Wilmington from the 2nd to the 3rd District.
  - Moving the portion of East Hollywood in the 3rd to the 2nd District.
1. Total population deviation is 2.81%, where in the Original S1 Plan was 0.57%.
  2. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,375,553, where in the Original S1 it was 3,350,000. There is a potential to move about 25,000 additional people.

3. This plan does not displace any Supervisor from his or her District. It is contiguous and reasonably compact.
4. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) – The percentages for CVAP are similar, most with less than a 1% differential. Some examples, including an instance where the difference is slightly higher, are:

	Original S1	Revised S1
District 2 – Hispanic	34.9%	33.7%
District 3 – Hispanic	14.2%	15.2%
District 2 – African American	36.2%	36.5%

Mr. Zimmerman reminded the Committee that the proposers of this map did not use the software provided by the BRC; they used MAPTITUDE. And they used Census Tracts as opposed to our RDUs. Therefore, there are slight variations in certain areas. The analysis submitted by staff was based on our RDUs, so at some point, if the Revised S1 was to be recommended, those incongruities would need to be addressed.

Mr. Cheng referred to the map being depicted which showed the BLUE borders as those formed using our RDUs versus the RED borders reflecting those submitted from the original S1. There were some deviations and Mr. Cheng noted some examples.

Commissioner Acebo had an informational question. Regarding the S1 Proposed District 1, and looking at the San Fernando Valley (the southern border area), can you give me the names of the streets and where it divides?

Mr. Cheng responded indicating the streets as Van Nuys Boulevard, Oxnard Boulevard and Haseltine Avenue.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that, under Staff Reports, there were two different items. There was a question from Commissioner Harris regarding Proposition 54 from 2003; he noted Laura Brill, Outside Counsel, will be addressing that issue.

Ms. Brill – Commissioner Harris requested an evaluation of Proposition 54 from the 2003 Election cycle. That was a proposition that would have prevented the State from collecting certain racial data. Because it specifically addresses the issue of race, it is one that I think a court would look at closely in analyzing Voting Rights Act, Section 2 compliance. The results of Proposition 54 were consistent with the observation I made earlier, that Propositions do not reflect substantial polarization of voting on Los Angeles County. Proposition 54 lost overall in Los Angeles County.

**The results were:**

**District 1 – 79.5% opposed; District 2 – 84.3% opposed; District 3 – 70.1% opposed; District 4 – 65.8% opposed; and District 5 – 62.5% opposed. It was opposed in all Supervisory Districts.**

**Ms. Brill stated Commissioner Harris also had a question from the prior meeting about the imprisoned population. She worked with David Ely (Consultant) on that request. She stated that Mr. Ely was able to identify that the bulk of the imprisoned population in Los Angeles County were in Districts 1 and 5. He was unable to identify the home residences of the imprisoned population and she also did not have an answer. Ms. Brill stated this has also been an issue with the State redistricting. The Los Angeles Times has reported that the State has not been able to find that data and that the State was going to take steps to make that data available or collect that data in the future. She did not have a source for that information.**

**Commissioner Harris wanted to clarify that while there is no data regarding the permanent residence of those incarcerated, is there a way to ask those incarcerated where they would live, once they are released or where they lived prior to being incarcerated.**

**Ms. Brill restated that there is no data but the Census identifies the permanent residence as where they are incarcerated.**

**Therefore, Commissioner Harris made a recommendation that the Board review the maps, identify which Districts incarcerated residents come from for purposes of figuring out the most appropriate way to apportion their representation. Furthermore, just because an individual is incarcerated and technically resides in prison, doesn't mean, that is where they live or where they will return once they are released.**

**Commissioner Reyes asked Ms. Brill for clarification. Was it in your examination of Proposition 54 and from your previous conclusion, there was no substantial evidence of polarized voting in Los Angeles County?**

**Ms. Brill responded that she found that the propositions were consistent with crossover voting in the County of Los Angeles.**

**Commissioner Reyes – And that analysis was based on aggregate amounts of District outcomes, not the more fine-tuned analysis that examines and is typically used in racially polarized voting analysis precinct base assessments.**

**Ms. Brill responded that she looked District by District and found the results were so consistent that you did not need to be in a majority Latino CVAP District in order to have the same position as that held in SD1. So it is a very consistent finding.**

**Commissioner Reyes inquired as to what regions voted to support Proposition 54?**

**Ms. Brill stated that she did not break the data down by Region but ALL Districts opposed that proposition.**

**Commissioner Reyes – There were pretty substantial regions in some Districts that supported Proposition 54. Your analysis didn't consider that?**

**Ms. Brill – There was a City breakdown from the Secretary of State's website. It does provide a City by City breakdown as well as a breakdown based on State Senate District, and State Assembly District; so there would be a finer way to break the data down.**

**Commissioner Reyes requested that the information be provided to the Commission?**

**Ms. Brill responded that she could provide the whole document.**

**Commissioner Acebo asked for a breakdown of the data set challenges with regards to the incarcerated population and its reliability.**

**Mr. Ely – There are certain States on the East Coast where State Law requires separate treatment of prison populations. The Census Bureau collected specific information that is consistent with other information collected that allows separate treatment for the prison population. However, this was not done for California, so there is no data from the Census Bureau. To the best of his knowledge, there is no data that has**

been tabulated previously that would allow a consistent application of the home residence of the incarcerated population as of April 1, 2010; which is when the rest of the Census was done. There is a possibility of collecting data, however, within a timeframe, but the amount of work needed to collect that data and the confidentiality behind the data, is unknown. It appears that the total population approximation is about 40,000 people; of which a little over 10,000 is in District 1 and a little over 15,000 is in District 5, with some populations in the other Districts. So, the amount of population is small in terms of the deviations that occur in the Districts. This would be a much bigger issue in terms of smaller districts; however, the information presented represents less than 1%.

Commissioner Harris asked Ms. Brill regarding Proposition 54, how Santa Fe Springs voted, versus Rolling Hills Estates.

Mr. Brill – Santa Fe Springs was 25% in favor, 74.5% opposed; and Rolling Hills Estates was 43.3% in favor, 56.7% opposed.

Commissioner Hoffenblum asked as a point of interest, if students at USC were counted in the Census, as many are foreign-born students.

Mr. Ely stated all students were accounted for at USC, as long as that was their place of residence on the day of the Census.

Commissioner Reyes – Have courts adopted the type of methodology you have used in assessing polarized voting in Los Angeles County? Do you know if racially polarized voting analysis has ever been used by large districts?

Ms. Brill – The review that I have done was an assessment to provide a general overview of what the likely results would be. I have never seen this kind of analysis rejected. Generally courts would take it into account as part of an analysis. I have not seen it accepted or rejected, but expect it to be confirmed, along with other types of analysis that can be done. For example, in the Cano case, the court looked at election results for various cities that were in districts being challenged, and evaluated how various elections came out. So, the Cano analysis was similar to the type of analysis performed here, looking at different parts or different districts, and how they voted.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the second item under the Staff Reports was a question from Commissioner Acebo, to report back on whether there were other considerations that could be identified that could be

evaluated along side some of the comments that have been made regarding "packing and cracking". This would be addressed by Mr. Ely.

Mr. Ely – The modified Benchmark plan was looked at as there were some concerns that the modification to the Benchmark that were being proposed, showed increased "packing". It appears that the modifications that are being proposed reduce the concentration of Latinos marginally in District 1, increases the numbers marginally in District 4, and decreases the numbers marginally in District 5. Therefore, I don't think that it is in any way accurate to say that it increases packing, if packing exists. He also looked to see if there were straightforward ways that the proposals could be modified that would reduce the concentration of Latinos in District One. There are a few potential options that could be considered that have that affect. This was mostly looking at the Latino communities that are adjacent to other districts and have some connection with them. The main communities that would fall into the category would be; the Westlake area on the extreme western edge of District 1, Pomona, and the South East cities adjacent to Downey. Those kinds of cities could be looked at if one wanted to modify the plan in a way that would reduce the concentration of Latinos in the 1st District.

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Commission and spoke about Cano and what the court said was that plaintiff's proposal in terms of the methodology that was submitted and that it was not accepted. It did not have the traditional polarized voting analysis that has been used in countless court cases around the country, so it looked at parts of districts. That's why Cano is irrelevant in his opinion because the proper polarized voting study wasn't conducted there. Regarding testimony on District 4, the comments regarding the reduction of Asians is not there, as the proposed Plan S1 shows an increase in Asian CVAP. For District 5, it socio-economically fits.

Commissioner Martinez commented on the Cano case ruling. The judges gave a lot of weight to the fact that the maps were produced by Latino elected officials and Latinos were a part of drawing the districts and voted for the plan. We may or may not have that with Plan A1, as amended. The Cano court stated that this was a heavy consideration.

Commissioner Acebo asked, what was the finding by the judge in Cano?

Mr. Brill – The finding of the judge was that the districts satisfied Section 2.



Commissioner Ollague asked who the well-known scholars on polarized voting are.

Ms. Brill stated there is an exhaustive list and she did not want to arbitrarily call out names, and would provide a list to the Committee, if desired.

**Attachments:**    [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Staff report](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PROP 54 Report](#)

8. Consideration of redistricting plans submitted by the public, including discussion of potential revisions by Committee members. (11-3288)

**Commissioner Acebo thanked Professor Levitt for his report, but inquired if there were other elections that were not included that could have provided the Committee with additional data that would help during the Committees deliberations.**

**Ms. Brill indicated that there were additional elections that should have been included that could have aided the Committee, including election data in recent years. Furthermore, there were additional ways of looking at the data that should be assessed.**

**Commissioner Acebo also inquired about crossover voting and whether or not elections where the boundaries were specifically drawn to elect a minority candidate should be used for crossover analysis.**

**Ms. Brill indicated that the courts generally look at a wide array of races. For example, the City of Los Angeles' mayoral race is certainly an election that would be considered. In addition, the City Attorney election would also be very probative.**

**Commissioner Acebo concluded by stating that both plans; Plan S1 as amended and Plan A1 as amended meet the criteria that the BRC is bound by to provide a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, there is nothing in the record that would suggest one plan or another does not comply with or violates the VRA.**

**Ms. Brill briefly reviewed Professor Levitt's binder and did not see anything going district by district for the Benchmark plan. For example, there was nothing that indicated that in each of the other districts there was not a fair opportunity for Latinos to elect a candidate of choice. Based on Ms. Brill's initial review of Mr. Levitt's report, it did not appear that he had provided sufficient information to show that there was a violation of the VRA.**

**Commissioner Martinez asked if there were any written records that Ms. Brill provided the Committee that indicate that there is not a violation of Section 2 of the VRA.**

**Ms. Brill stated that she has not provided written testimony to the**

Committee as she has appeared before the Committee to answer their questions and there is a Committee motion that further analysis done at the Board level to confirm the initial recommendation.

Commissioner Reyes questioned whether Ms. Brill's racial polarization analysis includes any of the five methods that Professor Barreto referenced and as Professor Levitt described as state of the art for racial polarized voting (RPV).

Ms. Brill stated that she has not yet had the opportunity to fully review the data in Professor Barreto's report.

Commissioner Reyes questioned if Ms. Brill conducted bivariate correlation RPV analysis to determine the extent of racial polarized voting.

Ms. Brill indicated that she has begun to conduct a regression analysis to confirm her initial assessment.

Commissioner Reyes inquired as to which type of regression analysis Ms. Brill was conducting.

Ms. Brill indicated that she used an ecological regression analysis.

Commissioner Reyes asked Ms. Brill if she used "Kings" or "Goodman" ecological regression analysis.

Ms. Brill stated that she does not recall at this juncture.

Commissioner Martinez reiterated that the Committee cannot solely rely on the City of Los Angeles election because the City of Los Angeles is not comparable to the large supervisory districts and not all of the areas of a district are included for City of Los Angeles elections.

In addition, Commissioner Acebo stated that there is no report to suggest that Plan A1 as amended violates the Voting Rights Act.

Ms. Brill stated that she has discussed with the Committee her review and preliminary assessment based on a Committee motion to adopt a plan subject to further Section 2 analysis. Again, referencing Professor Levitt's analysis, there are a couple of old propositions mentioned; however,

none from the current decade and it also did not include any general elections.

Commissioner Harris indicated that the City of Los Angeles is, for lack of a better word, "liberal." Only 25% voted in favor of Proposition 54 compared to the City of Long Beach (30%). Although there isn't a large difference, it's significant enough to mention. One of the proposals

suggested taking smaller communities such as Santa Fe Springs, which was more inclined to vote similarly to the City of Los Angeles, and put them in a district that is dominated by the City of Long Beach. Another proposal suggests expanding the boundaries in such a way that communities like Santa Fe Springs is in the district that is in the South Eastern portion of the County. The point is simply that one of the non-partisan ballot measures where the issue of race and race relations was on the ballot revealed the polarization at least anecdotally. The polarization was seen between such cities as San Marino and how they differed from Santa Fe Springs. Which communities are going to be able to express their preferences with regards to the equitable distribution of resources?

On motion of Commissioner Hatanaka, seconded by Commissioner Hoffenblum, adopt Plan A1 as amended as this Committee's recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Hatanaka further added that Special Counsel has advised the Committee that the current benchmark plan is likely in compliance with the relevant VRA tests. Ms. Brill reiterated that a second Latino district does not appear to be mandated. There is no compelling reason to arbitrarily and drastically alter the current supervisory boundary structure of how the 9.8 million County residents are to be represented. The Committee received compelling support from 1,000 e-mails, letters, public testimony both here and out in the community asking the Committee to make as little change as possible. Political access for all ethnic populations is protected and not abridged as Plan S1 as amended suggests. Plan S1 as amended clearly uses race as the chief factor in assigning boundaries and, in the process, is unacceptably disruptive to all County residents: It tramples on communities of interest, it splits political and civic subdivisions, it separates many historic ethnic enclaves and it would interfere with the rich ethnic group diversity that exists with the current supervisory districts. This ethnic group balance exists not because of a BRC policy or just because of race, but as one of

our speakers noted: "...for many of the County's residents, ethnic diversity is reflective of conscious social, economic and educational choices where County residents have chosen to live. Race is only one of those factors."

In order to achieve its objectives, Plan S1 as amended reassigns 3.3 million residents. In comparison Plan A1 as amended only reassigns 150,000 residents. With all of its restructuring, Plan S1 as amended still maintains a high population deviation of 2.81 percent compared to 1.69 percent in Plan A1 as amended. In addition, Plan S1 as amended defers/advances the vote of nearly 23 percent of all County voters compared to Plan A1 as amended which only defers/advances 1.5 percent of all County voters. Plan S1 as amended divides 32 cities and unincorporated areas as compared to Plan A1 as amended, which only split 3 communities which were previously split. Plan A1 as amended also increases Latino CVAP representation within the Fourth District and alternatively reduces an equivalent number in the First District.

Ms. Brill clarified an earlier comment she made regarding Section 2 compliance. Although the preliminary findings suggest compliance, Ms. Brill has yet to conduct a full, more complete Section 2 compliance analysis.

Mr. Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee regarding the U.S. Supreme Court ruling for *Bartlett vs. Strickland*. The Supreme Court ruled that majority and minority districts are only required if all three Gingles factors are met, with Section 2 applying based on a totality of circumstances. If you meet the Gingles three criteria and you meet the majority of totality, you are required, that is what the Supreme Court said. You have two reasonably compact districts and there is evidence submitted that Latinos tend to vote as a group with a significant percentage. In addition, the elections you would want to focus on are ones where Latino vs. Whites and African Americans vs. Whites. Mr. Clayton assumes that the propositions reviewed were Propositions 227, 209 and 187 and demonstrated a clear divide between how Latinos voted and how Whites voted. Instances where non-controversial propositions are cited is basically a defensive tactic, which usually the Courts recognize and throw out. In addition, you could flood the study with White vs. White elections. Mr. Clayton is familiar with Professor Barreto's work and considers him an expert. The California Citizens Redistricting Commission hired Professor Barreto as their expert.

**Mr. Clayton believes the Committee is making a sad commentary on progress in Los**

**Angeles County by voting on a plan that is clearly illegal, clearly violates Section 2 of the VRA, clearly involves packing and will result in litigation against the Board of Supervisors which could cost the public.**

**Motion by Commissioner Andrade, seconded by Commissioner Escandon to recommend the proposed Plan S1 as amended failed with the following vote:**

- Ayes:** 4 - Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Choi and Commissioner Harris
- Noes:** 6 - Chair Pedersen, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hollister, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Hoffenblum and Commissioner Sun

**Commissioner Hoffenblum would have liked to have seen a third alternative plan. The BRC is comprised of diverse group of individuals, but the problem the Committee had is that some positively had to draw two districts that were 50 percent Latino majority. Commissioner Hoffenblum was disappointed with the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) who were given a one week extension, but submitted a three-district plan. The Committee heard from various groups regarding their opposition to Plan S1 as amended. In addition, under Plan S1 as amended, several communities would be represented under a new Supervisor who would be termed out soon resulting in a break in continuity for these residents. Commissioner Hoffenblum stated lines should not be drawn based on incumbency, but it must be taken into consideration. In addition, if the Committee recommended Plan S1, it would cause more racial polarized voting and community leaders throughout the County would be up in arms. Those community leaders may also believe that Plan S1 constitutes racial gerrymandering to let two Latinos into the Board of Supervisors. There are two Supervisors who will be termed out in 2014 and can not seek reelection. Commissioner Hoffenblum believes a better plan could have been developed if the Committee thought a little bit more long term.**

**Commissioner Harris suggested that when these plans are adjusted, the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County should be considered because they rely on the County for their municipal services.**

The distinction and the priority for avoiding splits ought to be the unincorporated areas. Most of the residents that gave testimony today do not rely, unless they live in unincorporated areas, on very many County services. Those relying on County services have not been victimized by the types of rollbacks in government support for their programs that we see impacting other communities. In conclusion, if there were advocates stepping forward, they would have a slightly different perspective than the individual members the Board of Supervisors when it comes to those issues.

Commissioner Acebo inquired which plan splits more unincorporated areas.

Mr. Cheng indicated that the summary of all the plans lists the number of communities split for each plan. The proposed Plan A1 as amended plan splits 35 communities and the proposed Plan S1 as amended plan splits 34 communities. Mr. Cheng noted that some of the communities that are split have zero population.

Commissioner Reyes responded to Commissioner Hoffenblum's comments that the proposed Plan S1 as amended plan may constitute a racial gerrymander, indicating that this opinion is not consistent with establishing liability under the Voting Rights Act. Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your perspective, the Committee is constrained by the Voting Rights Act, U.S. Constitution, and other provisions of the State statutes and County Charter. Furthermore, as opposed to repeating the comments made earlier, Commissioner Reyes would like to voice the First District's opposition to Plan A1 as amended and incorporate by reference the comments made during Professor Levitt's report on discussion of Plan S1 as amended.

Commissioner Acebo stated that this has been an arduous process, but it has also been a good one, a transparent one, an honest and direct one. Regardless of the result, that is a hallmark of what the BRC was intended to do. From the Third District's perspective, we have been trying to get to the hard evidence, justification from the law and the data that would really speak to the wholesale change of districts as contemplated in Plan S1 as amended; the results are inconclusive. The Third District was unable to find evidence direct or otherwise that compel the Third District to support those wholesale changes. The most prudent recommendation would be Plan A1 as amended. Therefore the Third District is in support of Plan A1 as amended.

**On motion of Commissioner Hatanaka, seconded by Commissioner Hoffenblum to adopt Plan A1 as amended as this Committee's recommendation to the Board of Supervisors passed with the following vote:**

- Ayes:** 7 - Chair Pedersen, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hollister, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Hoffenblum and Commissioner Sun
- Noes:** 3 - Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Choi and Commissioner Harris

**Attachments:** [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Professor Justin Levitt Report](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - First & Second District Transmittal Letter](#)

9. Consideration and approval of recommendations by the Boundary Review Committee to the Board of Supervisors regarding supervisory boundaries. (11-3289)
- On Chair Pedersen's recommendation with there being no objections, agenda items eight and nine were addressed concurrently.**
10. Staff report on timeline for submitting Boundary Review Committee recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and initial hearing before Board of Supervisors. (11-3304)

**Mr. Zimmerman stated the supporting document provided today sets forth a timeline, starting with today being the last meeting of the Boundary Review Committee, and then the Plan going before the Board of Supervisors. The notice for the public hearing will publish on July 25, 2011. The first targeted public hearing will be August 9, 2011. There is a date indicated for the second public hearing and the 30-day period after final approval of the ordinance for it to be effective. As you can see, the ordinance needs to be effective by October 31, 2011. If the Board is unable to approve a redistricting plan with a 4/5 vote, then the responsibility for approving a plan would go to a Special Redistricting**



---

**Commission, consisting of the Sheriff, District Attorney, and the Assessor which would have to act by December.**

**Attachments:**    [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Staff Report](#)

### **III. MISCELLANEOUS**

#### **Matters Not Posted**

11. Matters not on the posted agenda, to be discussed and (if requested) placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda. (11-3290)

**No discussion or action was taken by the Commission.**

#### **Additional Public Comment**

12. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-3276)

**Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee as his final opportunity to speak before them. He suggested that the Committee look at the advice they give to the Board of Supervisors and think about the taxpayers of Los Angeles County. He thanked the Committee for their time and was saddened by the recommendation that will go before the Board of Supervisors and hopes it is rejected.**

**Commissioner Acebo on behalf of the 3rd District thanked the Chair for his leadership and fellow members for their time and effort and renewing efforts over the decade and new ones. Additionally, he gave his deepest thanks to the staff for their fine work and patience with this Committee.**

Chair Pedersen thanked Commissioner Acebo for his remarks and added his appreciation to staff as well as Commissioners, noting that even though it may have been contentious at times, it never got above civility. He thanked all the Commissioners for a job well done.

**Adjournment**

13. Adjournment for the meeting of July 13, 2011. (11-3292)

**The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 p.m.**